

REMARKS

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance. Claims 1-18 are now present in this application. Claims 1, 7, and 12 are independent. Reconsideration of this application based on the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Priority Under 35 U.S.C. § 119

Applicant thanks the Examiner for acknowledging Applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119, and receipt of the certified priority document.

Drawings

Since no objection has been received, Applicant assumes that the drawings are acceptable and that no further action is necessary. Confirmation thereof in the next Office Action is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1, 2, 4, and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,589,301 to Christopher et al. ("Christopher") Further, claims 1-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,670,996 to Jiang. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Complete discussions of the Examiner's rejections are set forth in the Office Action, and are not being repeated here.

The present invention is directed to a digital TV system for supporting a film mode. The present invention includes a film mode detection unit, a film mode processing unit, and an OSD processing unit. The film mode detection unit detects whether a decoded video signal received in the form of TS (transport stream) or an input video signal received in the form of CVBS or YPbPr component corresponds to a film. The film mode processing unit generates an original frame from two fields except for repeated fields among N fields inputted in an interlaced scanning method if the film mode is detected by the film mode detection unit, and converts the

generated frames into N frames of a progressive scanning type by repeatedly outputting the generated frames three times or twice by a specified rule. The OSD processing unit displays an icon for indicating the film mode on a predetermined position of a TV screen if the film mode is detected by the film mode detection unit. Applicant respectfully submits that neither Christopher nor Jiang show or describe the claimed film mode processing unit.

Regarding Christopher, the Examiner alleges that the claimed film mode processing unit is disclosed at col. 7, lines 45-59. Applicant respectfully submits that the cited passage fails to show or describe the particulars of the film mode processing unit.

Specifically, independent claim 1 requires that the film mode processing unit generates an original frame from two fields except for repeated fields among N fields inputted in an interlaced scanning method if the film mode is detected by the film mode detection unit. The film mode processing mode unit converts the generated frames into N frames of a progressive scanning type **by repeatedly outputting the generated frames three times or twice by a specified rule.** In other words, when there are N fields in interlaced scanning form, the film mode processing unit generates an image from two fields, excluding the repeating fields, and the generated image is repeatedly output three or two times based on a specific rule to provide a progressive scanning form.

Christopher states that “the end result of the correlation produces two signals, providing (1) the presence of the film originated material and (2) the identity of which of the two adjacent fields to use for line-doubling or field rate doubling”, col. 7, lines 56-59. Christopher is silent as to outputting a generated image three or two times based on a specific rule.

For at least this reason, Christopher fails to teach or suggest the claimed invention and the § 103 rejection of claim 1 must be withdrawn.

Regarding Jiang, the Examiner alleges that the claimed film mode processing unit is taught by display generator 470, which converts either progressive or interlaced video into progressive format as discussed at col. 2, lines 6-9. Applicant respectfully submits that the cited passage fails to show or describe the particulars of the film mode processing unit. Specifically, the referenced passage states “[w]hen showing DVD/MPEG2 video on a progressive computer monitor, the video display needs to be adjusted for field or frame content, in order to decrease motion artifacts.” This

passage fails to show or describe a generated frame is repeated three or two times based on a specific rule. Furthermore, the “bob” and “weave” methods for displaying video data described at col. 7, lines 59 to col. 8, line 61 do not follow the three or two pattern claimed.

For at least this reason, Jiang fails to teach or suggest the claimed invention and the § 103 rejection of claim 1 must be withdrawn.

In addition to the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submit that the modification of Christopher and Jiang to include OSD as suggested by the Examiner cannot be maintained. While Applicant is willing to concede that OSD is well known, the Examiner has failed to provide any evidence that OSD could be combined with Christopher or Jiang as proposed by the Examiner. The Examiner provides no support for this allegation. M.P.E.P. § 2144.03 states:

If the applicant traverses such an assertion the examiner should cite a reference in support of his or her position.

When a rejection is based on facts within the personal knowledge of the examiner, the data should be stated as specifically as possible, and the facts must be supported, when called for by the applicant, by an affidavit from the examiner.

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner provide the evidence required under this Section of the M.P.E.P. so that Applicant can properly respond to the rejection.

With regard to dependent claims 2-5, Applicant submit that claims 2-5 depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claim 1, which is allowable for the reasons set forth above, and therefore claims 2-5 are allowable based on their dependence from claim 1, as well as for their independently recited subject matter. Reconsideration and allowance thereof are respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner states that claims 7-18 are allowable. Applicant thanks the Examiner for the indication that claims 7-18 are allowed.

The Examiner also states that claim 6 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. However, claim 6 has not been rewritten in independent form at this time, since it is believed that independent claim 1 from which this claim depends is allowable.

Additional Cited References

Since the remaining references cited by the Examiner have not been utilized to reject the claims, but have merely been cited to show the state of the art, no comment need be made with respect thereto.

Office Action

The Office Action contains numerous characterizations of the invention, the claims, and the related art, with which Applicant does not necessarily agree. Unless expressly noted otherwise, Applicant declines to subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone Chad D. Wells, Registration No. 50,875, at (703) 205-8000, in the Washington, D.C. area.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

Application No. 10/657,095
Amendment dated July 28, 2006
Reply to Office Action of April 20, 2006

Docket No.: 0465-1049P
Page **6 of 6**

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: July 28, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By Esther Chong

Esther H. Chong

Registration No.: 40,953

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant

CDW